

**I. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of November 23, 2009 (Office Action). As a result of this Amendment, claim 1, 3 and 4 have been amended. Claims 12-25 were previously withdrawn. Claims 1-11 remain in the Application.

In paragraph 2 at page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,825,875 to Strub *et al.* (hereinafter Strub) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,846 to Rosenberg *et al.* (hereinafter Rosenberg).

**II. Applicant's Invention**

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicant's embodiments prior to addressing the references cited in the Office Action. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by independent Claims 1 and 4, describes a system of recording and distributing a multimedia presentation of an event experienced by a participant to a portable mobile phone device in a format suitable for presentation at the mobile phone device comprising at least one digital camera for recording the event experienced by the participant in a video presentation, a haptic information generator for generating signals simulating the motion experienced at the event while the participant is experiencing the event, a processor for combining and synchronizing the haptic information with the video presentation forming the multimedia presentation in the format suited for presentation at the mobile device, and a wireless transmitter for transmitting the multimedia presentation to the portable mobile phone device which can have a vibration device within the portable mobile phone device that is selectively activated in accordance with the haptic information.

**III. The Claims Define Over the Prior Art**

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,825,875 to Strub in view of Rosenberg. Strub discusses a hybrid recording system that includes a portable video recorder and auxiliary device that enables "low attention recording" that requires little interaction from the person recording the events. The auxiliary device in Strub does not record or provide for haptics and is not a phone or portable mobile phone device contrary to the Examiner's characterization. Instead, the auxiliary device can be a position sensor such as a GPS receiver or tilt sensor or heart rate monitoring device. See col. 5, lines 49-67. Strub only refers to producing visual and/or aural phenomenon (see col. 7, lines 1-10) and not haptic or tactile responses as claimed. Furthermore, Strub fails to discuss,

suggest, mention or contemplate the presentation of the multimedia presentation on a mobile communication device or formatting the recorded content or the combined content (with haptic information) in a format suited for a mobile phone. Furthermore, Strub fails to teach or suggest a mobile phone device having a vibrator that selectively activates in accordance with the haptic information captured during the recording of an event. Instead, Strub merely includes a monitor display and not a portable communication device or portable mobile phone device. Thus, Strub fails to teach a portable mobile communication device nor a tactile sensor output.

The Examiner recognizes that Strub fails to teach having haptic information simulating the motion experienced during an event and a vibration device. Thus, the examiner introduces Rosenberg as a reference for teaching the deficits of Strub. Rosenberg provides force feedback or tactile feedback or haptic feedback more for purposes of gaming rather than for purposes of replaying an experienced event by a user. Rosenberg also fails to discuss, suggest, mention or contemplate the presentation of the multimedia presentation on a mobile phone device, let alone a mobile phone device having a vibrator that selectively activates in accordance with the haptic information captured during the recording of an event. Instead, Rosenberg discusses a haptic feedback planar touch control used to provide input to a computer and not a mobile phone device. The touch input device of Rosenberg includes a planar touch surface that inputs a position signal to a processor of the computer based on a location of user contact on the touch surface. The computer can position a cursor in a displayed graphical environment based at least in part on the position signal, or perform a different function. At least one actuator is also coupled to the touch input device and outputs a force to provide a haptic sensation to the user contacting the touch surface.

The touch input device of Rosenberg can be a touchpad separate from the computer's display screen, or can be a touch screen. Output haptic sensations on the touch input device can include pulses, vibrations, and spatial textures. The touch input device can include multiple different regions to control different computer functions. Note that Rosenberg does not record a multimedia presentation of an event having video and audio and provide and further fails to provide haptic information or have a haptic information generator for generating signals simulating the motion experienced at the event. In this context and as claimed, the application of Rosenberg to the claims here appear misplaced. Further note that the alternative embodiments described in Rosenberg in Col 3, lines 55-63 do not include a mobile phone device and seem to emphasize "stand-up arcade game machines" or a "video game console" or a television "set top box". Also note that the haptics involved in Rosenberg appear more related

to haptic feedback to provide some type of resistance or feedback during a game (see Col. 6, lines 18-23) rather than the use of haptics to simulate an event or experience already experienced by the user. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would fail to conceive or contemplate the claimed embodiments in view of the teachings of Strub and Rosenberg.

With respect to claim 6, Strub refers to a family trip to an amusement park as an example of a group event where an experience can be shared from multiple perspectives from different members of the group. Claim 6 is not directed necessarily to a group perspective and is just enumerating different types of events that can be experienced using Applicant's unique method and system. One of the events can be an amusement ride such as a roller coaster for example.

With respect to Claims 9-11, in addition to the deficiencies already noted above with respect to Strub and Rosenberg, none of the references alone or in combination discuss, suggest, mention or contemplate the presentation of the multimedia presentation on a mobile phone device device, let alone a mobile communication device having a vibrator that selectively activates in accordance with the haptic information captured during the recording of an event and recorded (and combined with haptic information) in a format suited for a mobile phone. None of the references alone or in combination teach a wireless transmitter for transmitting the multimedia presentation to the portable mobile phone device having a vibration device within the portable mobile phone device that is selectively activated in accordance with the haptic information. Furthermore, none of the references alone or in combination teach or suggest where the system additionally comprises a distribution computer that uploads the multimedia presentation and synchronizes the multimedia presentation with the haptic information or where the distribution computer uploads the multimedia presentation and a heart rate file generated from the heart monitor and synchronizes the multimedia presentation with the haptic information.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 24, 2010

/Pablo Meles/  
Pablo Meles, Reg. No. 33,739  
Guntin Meles & Gust, PLC  
Customer No. 55794  
Telephone: (954) 389-4846